

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,259	09/10/2003	Hitoshi Sato	953.1010	4011
21171 75	21171 7590 07/01/2005		EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			TRAN, DIEM T	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	•		3748	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\mathcal{P}$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/658,259	SATO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Diem Tran	3748
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>RCE</u> 2a)    This action is <b>FINAL</b> .    2b)    This  3)    Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		•
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/658,259

Art Unit: 3748

#### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the RCE filed on 5/2/05. As instructed by the RCE, an amendment filed on 5/2/05 has been entered. In this amendment, claims 1, 5 have been amended. Overall, claims 1-5 are pending in this application.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludecke et al. (US Patent 4,211,075).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, Ludecke discloses an internal combustion engine exhaust gas purifying system having a continuous regenerating diesel particulate filter system in an exhaust passage of an internal combustion engine to oxidize and remove collected particulate matter by performing a regenerating-mode operation when a quantity of the collected particulate matter in a filter of the filter system to collect the particulate matter is equal to a predetermined judgment value for regeneration, comprising:

collected-quantity estimation means for estimating the quantity of collected particulate matter in the filter (see col. 4, lines 9-11, 24-30); and maximum-fuel-injection-quantity restricting means for restricting a maximum fuel injection quantity of the internal combustion engine when the quantity of the collected particulate matter estimated by the collected-quantity

Application/Control Number: 10/658,259 Page 3

Art Unit: 3748

estimation means is equal to a predetermined judgment value for restriction, the maximum fuel injection quantity restricting means restricting the maximum fuel injection quantity during the regeneration mode operation (see col. 6, lines 6-15).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludecke et al. (US Patent 4,211,075) in view of Sato et al. (US Patent 4,535,588).

Ludecke discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose that the collected-quantity estimation means estimates the quantity of collected particulate matter in accordance with the differential pressure between the upstream and downstream of the filter. Sato teaches that it is conventional in the art, to estimate the quantity of collected particulate matter in accordance with the differential pressure between the upstream and downstream of the filter (se col. 5, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Sato in the Ludecke system, since the use thereof would have provided a means for initiating the regeneration of the filter.

Application/Control Number: 10/658,259

Art Unit: 3748

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludecke et al. (US Patent 4,211,075) in view of Kuenstler et al. (JP 2002-195086).

Ludecke discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose that the continuous regenerating diesel particulate filter system uses a system constituted by setting an oxidation catalyst to the upstream side of the filter. Kuenstler teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a continuous regenerating diesel particulate filter system comprising an oxidation catalyst (9) located on the upstream side of the filter (10) (see Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Kuenstler in the Ludecke system, since the use thereof would have provided a means to increase the temperature of the particulate filter.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 5/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive. The Applicant argued that the Ludecke reference fails to disclose the time for beginning the restriction of fuel injection quantity can occur during or not during the period of regeneration. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, since the Ludecke reference discloses restricting the maximum fuel injection quantity during the regeneration mode operation (see col. 6, lines 6-15).

Application/Control Number: 10/658,259

Art Unit: 3748

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed

to Examiner Diem Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4866. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8:00 a.m.- 5:30p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax number

for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for

unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about

the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

DT

June 24, 2005

Diem Tran

Patent Examiner

Art unit 3748

THOMAS DENION SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**